



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to the want of connection between economics and the biological group of sciences, the truth underlying this statement never comes home so directly to any one else as to the biological student. It is the latter who is able to grasp at the outset the importance of the fundamental fact that the forces concerned in our evolution in society are not those which make primarily for our happiness, but rather those which tend to bring all the members of society into the fairest and freest rivalry it is possible to attain to. Hence all our progress, as Professor Marshall has well remarked, is towards "freedom of industry and enterprise, or, more shortly, economic freedom."

Professor Nicholson's criticism of modern socialism is scarcely as full or as searching as could be wished. It can hardly be questioned nowadays that economists would better serve the cause of science by following the example of Schäffle in undertaking a more detailed examination of the proposals of socialism, rather than by confining themselves to general remarks as to the impossibility or the impracticability of socialist utopias. It is the more regrettable that Professor Nicholson has followed the general custom, as he seems to have a firm grasp of the important fact, missed by many in these times, that the ultimate effect of most of the apparent exceptions to the freedom of contract which we are allowing under the pressure of so-called socialist tendencies, is not to limit this freedom, but to give it reality.

BENJAMIN KIDD.

A HISTORY OF SOCIALISM. By Thomas Kirkup. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black.

It is somewhat difficult to discover the position which Mr. Kirkup intended his work to occupy with regard to the history of Socialism. To a writer treating of a movement such as this there are at least three ways open. He may examine the nature of Socialism, putting it in his mental balance and pronouncing his judgment in its disparagement or its favor; or he may pass in review the theories of its chief supporters, expounding, contrasting, and examining them. But there is still a third way. He may write the history of the movement in its true sense, that is, describe its origin and progress. As Mr. Kirkup has written a previous work, and as that work deals with Socialism from the first of these three supposed stand-points, the present volume does not attempt intrusion into the province of its predecessor. But which of the latter two ways of handling

his subject does Mr. Kirkup adopt? Is he writing a history of theory or a history of a movement? This is a question which it is much easier to ask than to answer, for traces of departures in both directions meet the reader. Mr. Kirkup starts off to discuss the theories of the French Communists and of a couple of German Socialists, and concludes with an account of the nature of Anarchism in Russia and the present condition of Socialism in Europe. Complete separation between the theories of the prominent leaders and the history of a movement is, of course, impossible, as, indeed, it is undesirable; for no true historian can or should attempt to describe what people are doing without describing what they are thinking. But there is a difference between complete separation and subordination. If the history of the theories of Socialism are the subject of a book, the facts of the movement require notice so far, and only so far, as they serve to illustrate and give reality to and occasion for these theories; but if, on the other hand, it is the movement itself which occupies our attention, then the theories become in their turn influences and causes. Mr. Kirkup does not treat either the theories or the movement as subordinate. It is a pity that he did not lay down the lines of his work a trifle more definitely, for as it stands now it is unsatisfactory in whatever aspect we view it. So true is this that it is not unfair to say that in attempting both tasks he is successful in neither.

As a history of Socialistic theories the present work suffers from many and most serious defects. It follows the wearisome but time-honored custom of describing in considerable detail the essentially artificial schemes of St.-Simon and Fourier. It even criticises them. But if this be an instance of excessive commission, there are many of comparative omission. A reader who derived his knowledge from the study of Mr. Kirkup's book could not avoid the impression that till within a year or so there were no socialist writers in England, with the saving exception of Owen. Rodbertus, again, to turn to the German school, is treated to some six pages of most unsatisfactory criticism, while Lassalle, whose life was so much more interesting and whose Socialism was so much less thorough, receives close upon fifty. But if scientific influence is the test of an author's importance, surely the teacher of Lassalle and the real founder of German State Socialism deserves a little more attention. It is curious, too, to read of Schaeffle as the interpreter of Marx. If he is, the chief function of the interpreter must be deemed inimical, for in the "Quintessence of Socialism,"

the very work to which Mr. Kirkup refers, Schaeffle pitches overboard that theory of value which Marx cherishes with such misplaced affection, and refers somewhat triumphantly to a destructive criticism, published in another book, of social democracy. There are other failings of a different order noticeable when we turn to Mr. Kirkup's criticism of Socialistic and economic theories. It is somewhat late in the day to have to echo the oft-repeated remark that Marx and his followers based themselves not on Ricardo, but on their own misconceptions as to Ricardo's meanings; but in the face of Mr. Kirkup's constant assertions, repetition, however monotonous, is inevitable. It is, however, more pleasant to record instances of agreement than of difference.

There can be no doubt that the theory of *laissez-faire* has suffered repulse from the dominant position which it threatened to hold in the writings of economists, though possibly some economic historians will demur to the sweeping assertion that "In England, Socialists are now the chief promoters of the advance in economic study from the ordinary stand-point to the historical, and from the historical to the evolutionary point of view." Without staying to canvass the meaning of the later advance thus described, some readers, and amongst them the present writer, would no doubt like to know to which of the present school of economic historians reference is made—for these are surely the chief promoters of the advance towards the historical study of economics.

The chapters which deal with the more truly historical aspect of the Socialistic movement are somewhat unequal. The best is that which treats of Anarchism with especial reference to its connection with the more orthodox Socialism, and its growth and development in Russia. Others deal with the Red International, with the early English Socialism, and with the recent progress of Socialism, etc. Of these the most unsatisfactory is that which refers to England. No adequate attempt is made to account for the present aspect of Socialism in this country. There was a man named Robert Owen, and there is a present Socialistic party, is the burden of the story; but unfortunately the genesis of this party, and the early influences brought to bear on it, escape notice, with the not unnatural consequence that an undue importance in its formation is ascribed to Marx. But English Socialism is very indigenous in its character. A host of inferior writers urged its progress, and under the veil of various movements, political as well as social, it grew in strength

and made good its advance. This it is which gives it the importance which Mr. Kirkup deems its due.

E. C. K. GONNER.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LIVERPOOL.

DE LA DIVISION DU TRAVAIL SOCIAL. Par E. Durkheim. Paris : Félix Alcan, 1893.

This book, which appears from the title to be a work on political economy or sociology, is in reality a treatise on ethics. To speak more correctly, it seeks, in the economic and social facts summed up under the formula of the division of labor, the verification of a moral thesis. This thesis is as follows :

“Morality is developed in history and under the influence of historic causes ; that is, it has a part to perform in our every-day life. What it is at any given time depends on the conditions then prevalent in society which do not permit it to be otherwise. The proof of this is that morality changes when the conditions change, and only then. If the ancient Romans did not have the broad conception of humanity that we have to-day, this was not due to their narrowness of intelligence, but to the fact that such ideas were incompatible with the nature of a Roman town. Our cosmopolitanism could no more have existed there than a plant can grow in a soil not only incapable of nourishing it, but which is sure to kill it. But, on the other hand, the fact that cosmopolitanism has since made its appearance, is not due to any philosophical discoveries ; it is not because our minds have been opened to truths which we failed to appreciate before ; it is rather because changes have taken place in the structure of society which render necessary a change in our moral notions. Moral ideas, then, are formed, transformed, and maintained by causes of an experimental nature. These are the only causes which the science of ethics undertakes to ascertain.”

It seems clear, then, according to M. Durkheim, that changes in moral ideas are chiefly brought about by the transformations that occur in society as a whole. The author is, indeed, led by a natural progression of ideas to study the solidarity of society, of which he distinguishes two forms : one mechanical, due to the similarity of the elements that compose the social body ; the other organic, due to a division of labor among those elements, which more and more tend to differentiate. The first form is mainly found in ancient times, when society was divided into clans and castes ; the second belongs to our modern society. The study of these two forms brings M. Durkheim to the following conclusions :

“A characteristic of the moral order is that it sets forth the fundamental conditions of social solidarity. Law and morality are the ties which bind us to each other and to society, and which make of the entire mass of individuals an ag-